

In a word he is morally bound to play the game. For the preservation of internal peace the rooting out of errors and the teaching of sound political doctrine in the universities is essential. Public burdens should be fairly distributed. Rewards and punishments are useful instruments of pacification, the obedient subject being exalted and the factious held in contempt. The wise ruler will never try to cover every case by law, and the subject may do whatever is not forbidden. The object of laws is merely to direct men's actions, just as nature ordains the banks not to stay but to guide the course of the stream.

•The third and most novel part of the book, entitled "Religion," discusses the attitude of the Christian to the state with the aid of a multitude of texts. Here, too, there is no escape from the iron rule of obedience. Religious strife adds to political strife and must therefore cease. For spiritual matters are also the province of the state, which gives pastors their authority. Thus in a Christian commonwealth obedience is due to the sovereign in all things, as well spiritual and temporal. But what if the ruler is not a Christian? Must we resist when we cannot obey? "Truly no, for this is contrary to our civil covenant. What must we do then? Go to Christ by martyrdom, which, if it seems to any man to be a hard saying, most certain is it that he believes not with his whole heart that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God; for he would then desire to be dissolved and to be with the Father." Since the author had as little passion for martyrdom as any man who ever lived, this summons to a heroic death suggests that he is talking with his tongue in his cheek.

Hobbes was inordinately proud of his book. As Galileo was the founder of natural science, so, he declared, was he the

founder of the science of politics, his doctrine appearing to him as demonstrable as a proposition of Euclid. The claim is grotesque, but his originality is beyond question. Bpdin, his only real predecessor, was a lawyer, not a psychologist, and it was the essence of Hobbes's system that he grounded auto-cracy on his interpretation of human nature. His debt to Machiavelli is even slighter. Agreeing in their unflattering realism, they disagreed in almost everything else. The Englishman started from psychology, the Italian from history and personal experience. Machiavelli's Prince was subject to no moral law, but there is no doctrinal totalitarianism in his pages. He wrote primarily for rulers, Hobbes primarily for